

SECRET

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

3 July 1980

SUBJECT: Summary of Grill Flame Meeting, 1 July 1980

1. (U) Following outlines primary topics discussed at Grill Flame working group meeting chaired by DIA/DT on 1 July 1980. Members present consisted of:

SG1J
SG1I

[REDACTED] DIA
LTC MURRAY B. WATT, INSCOM

SG1J

SG1J

2. (S/NOFORN) PURPOSE: Meeting had been arranged by [REDACTED] to work out details of "joint program" concerning Project Grill Flame. [REDACTED] stated that he felt that the following conditions had already been agreed to by service representatives (MG Thompson, Army, and BG Marks, AF) (See incl 1 and 2) and Dr. Vorona, DIA prior to this meeting:

- a. That there would be a joint program for Grill Flame.
- b. That all parties concerned had agreed to provide approximately \$150K each for joint effort.
- c. That contractual effort would be with SRI with an additional smaller effort going to unknown (at this time) outfit to do work in area of PK (this effort would cost somewhere in the neighborhood of \$40K).

- d. Total effort would be programmed for 3 years.

SG1J

3. (S/NOFORN) I informed the members that I knew of no such agreement and that the INSCOM position was not in accords with what [REDACTED] had just outlined. I informed everyone that INSCOM's total budget for FY 81 was \$150K but that operational expenses had to come from that total and that approximately \$120-130K would be available for contractual work as needed. Further, I remarked that we should not limit ourselves to dealing strictly with SRI even though INSCOM was interested in dealing with SRI in two areas.....audio analysis and receiving training in their "new" RV concept.

4. (S/NOFORN) [REDACTED] stated that the proposed management of the joint effort would be as follows:

SG1J

- a. Dr. Vorona would be the chairperson.
- b. Each agency putting money into the program would serve as voting members on the committee.
- c. DIA would provide individual to serve as contract monitor at SRI. Individual would be physically located at SRI (this individual is going to be [REDACTED])

SG1J

GRILL FLAME**SECRET**

SECRET

d. Committee would meet quarterly to review progress, establish new tasking, etc.

5. (S/NOFORN) I stated that it appeared to be unnecessary and not logical in face of Gale Report to set up permanent position at SRI. DIA seems to feel that vast majority of contract work will be with SRI. Therefore, they are willing to take on this additional expense.

6. (U) I recommend that 1st order of business of the committee should be to draw up an MOU that should be signed off by all parties concerned.

SG1J

7. (S/NOFORN) I asked for clarification concerning the question of SRI using technique of remote viewing allegedly developed by Mr. Ingo Swann. It is my understanding that Mr. Swann has not given SRI permission to train anyone using methods that he has developed. [REDACTED] stated that he was aware of the possible conflict but felt that everything would be worked out properly. I requested that the committee be provided a firm answer to this question as soon as possible.

SG1J

8. (U) [REDACTED] informed everyone that a draft MOU and draft statement of objectives would be provided to all committee members tomorrow (2 July 1980).

SG1J

9. (U) [REDACTED] requested that INSCOM tell him how much money they would be putting into the joint program and provide recommendations on how the money should be spent.

10. (S/NOFORN) COMMENTS:

a. Advantages for joint effort-

(1) Gives united effort to program.

(2) More to gain for \$\$ spent. For example, INSCOM might be able to use DIA/AF monies for further training of their personnel.

(3) Cuts down on the number of individual contracts that would have to be generated.

(4) Could increase security.

b. I don't understand the role of DIA/DT in developing operational techniques for remote viewing. DoD has been told by Dr. Perry to get out of the R&D arena and anything that even resembles R&D type work is only asking for trouble.

c. Finally, I recommend against any joint program that identifies, at the outset, SRI as the primary contractor. Again, the Gale Committee Report recommended against further business with SRI and it seems to be asking for trouble to "fly in the face" of such a recommendation without at least giving some consideration to other agencies involved in parapsychological work.

11. (U) Inclosure 3 lists the specific tasks that INSCOM would like to see the committee work on over the next 2 years.

Murray B. Watt

MURRAY B. WATT
LTC, MI
Project Manager

*Reviewed by
Col White
14 July 80*

3 Incl

1. Cy ltr ACSI, re:GF Mtg 9 Apr 80(S)

2. Briefing on GF (S)

3. Specific Tasks to be Performed (S)

SECRET